

Early life history of the introduced seastar *Asterias amurensis* in the  
Derwent estuary, Tasmania: The potential for ecology-based  
management

Alice E. Morris (BSc. Hons)



Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Zoology, University of Tasmania (April 2002)

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>List of Tables and Figures .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>Declaration .....</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>The threat of marine introductions .....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Asterias amurensis in Australian waters .....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Ecology-based management of introduced marine pests .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Factors affecting the distribution and abundance of competent brachiolaria.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Fertilization ecology as a management tool.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Larval dispersal as a vector and priority .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Thesis outline .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>Chapter 2: Fertilization kinetics of the introduced seastar, <i>Asterias amurensis</i>, in the Derwent estuary, Tasmania .....</b>	<b>7</b>
ABSTRACT.....	7
INTRODUCTION.....	8
MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	11
<i>Induced spawning .....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Sperm density.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Egg density.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Sperm and egg release.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Ova diameter .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Sperm half-life .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Sperm velocity.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Effect of sperm dilution on fertilization success .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Effect of sperm aging and dilution on fertilization success .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Effect of egg concentration on fertilization success .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Effect of egg diameter on fertilization success .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Temporal and spatial variability in gonad indices.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Dependence of amount of gametes released on gonad index and seastar size ...</i>	<i>16</i>
RESULTS .....	17

---

<i>Fertilization parameters</i> .....	17
<i>Sperm half-life</i> .....	17
<i>Effect of sperm dilution on fertilization success</i> .....	18
<i>Effect of sperm aging and dilution on fertilization success</i> .....	18
<i>Effect of egg concentration on fertilization success</i> .....	20
<i>Effect of egg diameter on fertilization success</i> .....	20
<i>Temporal and spatial variability in gonad indices</i> .....	21
<i>Dependence of amount of gametes released on gonad index and seastar size</i> ...	23
DISCUSSION .....	24
<i>Variability in fertilization success</i> .....	24
<i>Sperm half-life</i> .....	25
<i>Polyspermy</i> .....	26
<i>Chemotaxis and fertilization</i> .....	26
<i>Gonad indices</i> .....	27

**Chapter 3: A discrete model of gamete dispersal and fertilization success in the introduced seastar *Asterias amurensis*, in the Derwent Estuary, Tasmania ...** 29

ABSTRACT .....	29
INTRODUCTION .....	30
MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	33
<i>In situ estimates of fertilization success</i> .....	33
<i>Flushing experimental flasks with sperm free water</i> .....	33
<i>Gamete vertical velocities</i> .....	34
<i>Model structure</i> .....	34
<i>Model validation</i> .....	36
<i>Sperm release rate sensitivity analysis</i> .....	36
<i>Model predictions for gametes simulated to disperse naturally</i> .....	37
RESULTS .....	38
<i>Empirical estimates of fertilization success</i> .....	38
<i>Flushing experimental flasks with sperm-free water</i> .....	38
<i>Gamete vertical velocities</i> .....	40
<i>Model validation</i> .....	40
<i>Sperm release rate sensitivity analysis</i> .....	40
<i>Model predictions for gametes simulated to disperse naturally</i> .....	41
<i>Attaining equilibrium</i> .....	41

---

DISCUSSION.....	43
<i>Empirical estimates of fertilization</i> .....	43
<i>Model calibration</i> .....	44
<b>Chapter 4: Variability in reproductive success of discrete populations of the introduced seastar <i>Asterias amurensis</i> in the Derwent Estuary, Tasmania:</b>	
<b>Model predictions.....</b>	<b>46</b>
ABSTRACT.....	46
INTRODUCTION.....	47
<i>Variability in fertilization success</i> .....	47
<i>Behaviour and fertilization success</i> .....	47
<i>Population characteristics and fertilization success</i> .....	48
MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	50
<i>Model landscape</i> .....	50
<i>Parameterization</i> .....	50
<i>Effect of population density</i> .....	50
<i>Effect of sex ratio</i> .....	51
<i>Effect of synchrony in spawning</i> .....	51
<i>Effect of group size</i> .....	51
<i>Effect of water depth</i> .....	51
RESULTS .....	52
<i>General</i> .....	52
<i>Effect of population density</i> .....	53
<i>Effect of sex ratio</i> .....	54
<i>Effect of spawning synchrony</i> .....	55
<i>Effect of group size</i> .....	55
<i>Effect of water depth</i> .....	56
DISCUSSION.....	57
<i>The Allee effect</i> .....	57
<i>Factors affecting fertilization success</i> .....	57
<i>Effect of population density</i> .....	57
<i>Effect of sex ratio</i> .....	58
<i>Effect of spawning synchrony</i> .....	58
<i>Effect of water depth</i> .....	58
<i>Setting management priorities</i> .....	59

---

<i>Model limitations</i> .....	60
<b>Chapter 5: Dispersal of an introduced seastar is influenced by behavioural responses of larvae to salinity and light</b> .....	<b>61</b>
ABSTRACT .....	61
INTRODUCTION .....	63
<i>The effect of larval vertical migration on dispersal</i> .....	64
MATERIALS AND METHODS: EXPERIMENTAL .....	65
<i>Larval culture</i> .....	65
<i>Larval response to salinity</i> .....	65
<i>Larval response to light</i> .....	67
MATERIALS AND METHODS: MODELLING .....	69
<i>Model description</i> .....	69
Parameterization.....	71
<i>General</i> .....	71
<i>Scenario 1: Effect of larval vertical migration</i> .....	72
<i>Scenario 2: Effect of river flow</i> .....	72
<i>Scenario 3: Effect of the site of larval release</i> .....	72
<i>Scenario 4: Effect of salinity dependent vertical migration</i> .....	73
RESULTS: EXPERIMENTAL .....	74
<i>Larval response to salinity</i> .....	74
<i>Larval response to light</i> .....	74
RESULTS: MODELLING .....	77
<i>General</i> .....	77
<i>Scenario 1: Effect of larval vertical migration</i> .....	78
<i>Scenario 2: Effect of river flow</i> .....	79
<i>Scenario 3: Effect of the distribution of larval release</i> .....	81
<i>Scenario 4: Effect of salinity dependent vertical migration</i> .....	81
DISCUSSION .....	83
<i>General</i> .....	83
<i>Swimming behaviour affects larval retention</i> .....	84
<i>The distribution of competent brachiolaria in the estuary</i> .....	85
<i>Development of the model</i> .....	85
<i>Summary of conclusions</i> .....	86

---

<b>Chapter 6: Settlement and metamorphosis of the introduced asteroid <i>Asterias</i></b>	
<b><i>amurensis</i>.....</b>	<b>87</b>
ABSTRACT.....	87
INTRODUCTION.....	88
MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	90
<i>Larval culture</i> .....	90
<i>Settlement and metamorphosis of larvae on different substrata</i> .....	90
<i>Assessment of the role of bacteria on the surface of NCA in inducing</i>	
<i>metamorphosis</i> .....	91
RESULTS .....	93
<i>Settlement and metamorphosis of larvae on different substrata</i> .....	93
<i>Assessment of the role of bacteria on the surface of NCA in inducing</i>	
<i>metamorphosis</i> .....	94
<i>Field measurements of settlement of larvae on standardised collectors</i> .....	94
DISCUSSION.....	96
<b>Chapter 7: General discussion .....</b>	<b>99</b>
<i>Setting management goals</i> .....	99
<i>Implications of fertilization ecology for management.</i> .....	99
<i>Implications of larval dispersal for management</i> .....	100
<i>Implications of settlement ecology for management</i> .....	101
<i>Future research</i> .....	101
<i>Observations of natural spawning</i> .....	101
<i>Validating the larval dispersal model</i> .....	102
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	102
<b>References .....</b>	<b>105</b>

---

## List of Tables and Figures

### Chapter 2: Fertilization kinetics of *Asterias amurensis*

<b>Figure 2.1.</b> The Derwent estuary, Tasmania, showing sites where starfish were collected to determine gonad indices. ....	12
<b>Table 2.1.</b> Spawning parameters in <i>Asterias amurensis</i> . ....	17
<b>Figure 2.2.</b> The effect of sperm age on fertilization success. ....	18
<b>Figure 2.3.</b> The effect of sperm dilution on fertilization success. ....	19
<b>Figure 2.4.</b> Interaction of sperm dilution and sperm viability. ....	19
<b>Figure 2.5.</b> The effect of egg dilution on fertilization success at three sperm dilutions. ....	20
<b>Figure 2.6.</b> Simulation results of the effect of egg diameter on fertilization success. ....	21
<b>Figure 2.7.</b> Temporal and spatial variability in gonad index. ....	22
<b>Figure 2.8.</b> The relationship between dry gametes release and gonad index and seastar weight. ....	23

### Chapter 3: A discrete model of gamete dispersal and fertilization success

<b>Figure 3.1.</b> Empirically measured fertilization success in <i>Asterias amurensis</i> . ....	38
<b>Figure 3.2.</b> Fertilization success of <i>Asterias amurensis</i> for downstream females offset from the axis of current flow. ....	39
<b>Figure 3.3.</b> Comparison of fertilization success of eggs released 4 m directly downstream from the spawning male with and without flushing flasks with sperm free water. ....	39
<b>Table 3.1.</b> Vertical velocity of individual eggs, and sperm clouds at three concentrations. ....	40
<b>Figure 3.4.</b> Sensitivity of predicted fertilization success to sperm release rates. ....	41
<b>Figure 3.5.</b> Model predictions of the total number of eggs fertilized and fertilization success of eggs released 0 m, 4 m, and 16 m directly downstream from a spawning male. ....	42

### Chapter 4: Variability in reproductive success of discrete populations

<b>Figure 4.1.</b> The effect of density of <i>Asterias amurensis</i> on fertilization success. ....	52
<b>Figure 4.2.</b> The effect of sex ratio of <i>Asterias amurensis</i> on fertilization success. ....	53
<b>Figure 4.3.</b> The effect of spawning synchrony of <i>Asterias amurensis</i> on fertilization success. ....	54
<b>Figure 4.4.</b> The effect of population size of <i>Asterias amurensis</i> on fertilization success. ....	56

### Chapter 5: Larval dispersal

<b>Figure 5.1.</b> Schematic of the method used to establish a salinity gradient. ....	66
<b>Figure 5.2.</b> The Derwent Estuary, Tasmania, showing the distribution of column centres in the inverse transport model. ....	69
<b>Table 5.1.</b> Summary of parameters used in the inverse transport model to simulate larval vertical swimming behaviour in response to salinity, and mortality due to exposure to low salinity water. ....	70
<b>Figure 5.3.</b> Schematic of one cell of the inverse transport model. ....	71
<b>Figure 5.4.</b> Vertical swimming response of <i>Asterias amurensis</i> larvae to salinity. ....	74



---

<b>Figure 5.5.</b> Changes in depth distribution of late bipinnaria larvae over 24 hours..	75
<b>Figure 5.6.</b> Depth distribution of late bipinnaria in response to three light regimes.....	76
<b>Table 5.2.</b> Summary of larval dilutions under different conditions of water flow, point of release of larvae, and swimming behaviour of larvae.....	77
<b>Figure 5.7.</b> The fate of larvae released in the Derwent Estuary in simulations with constant average river flow after 120 days of dispersal .....	78
<b>Figure 5.8.</b> The effect of swimming behaviour on the horizontal distribution of larvae in the Derwent Estuary at the end of the pelagic phase.....	79
<b>Figure 5.9.</b> The effect of river flow on larval dispersal..	80
<b>Figure 5.10.</b> Effect on larval dilution of larval behavioural response to salinity, and salinity-dependent mortality .....	82

## Chapter 6: Settlement ecology

<b>Figure 6.1.</b> The Derwent estuary, Tasmania showing sites where settlement sampling devices were deployed. ....	92
<b>Figure 6.2.</b> Settlement of laboratory reared <i>Asterias amurens</i> larvae exposed to 6 substrata common in the Derwent estuary.....	93
<b>Figure 6.3.</b> The effect of microbial film on the settlement and metamorphosis of competent brachiolaria.....	94
<b>Table 6.1.</b> Recruitment of asteroid larvae in the Derwent Estuary .....	95
<b>Figure 6.4.</b> Distribution of habitat types in the lower reaches of the Derwent Estuary at 1:100,000. From Jordan <i>et al.</i> (2001). ....	97

---

## Abstract

The early life-history of the introduced Northern Pacific seastar (*Asterias amurensis*) in the Derwent Estuary, Tasmania, is investigated with an aim to identify opportunities for improved management. A discrete non-equilibrium model of gamete dispersal and fertilization success is developed. The model is parameterized with species-specific gamete traits measured in the estuary population, and is validated using empirically determined estimates of fertilization success, which required containing gametes in collection flasks. *In situ* measurements of the proportion of eggs fertilized ranged from  $0.80 \pm 0.08$  (SE) adjacent to the spawning male, to  $0.16 \pm 0.04$  (SE) for separation distances of 16 m. The model is then adapted to simulate dispersal of gametes without the experimental artifact of containing gametes in flasks. There is good concordance between empirical estimates and model predictions when the model simulates the experimental procedure. However, when simulations allow for dispersal and fertilization without confinement of gametes in the collection device, predicted fertilization success is substantially lower at 0.05 adjacent to the spawning male and 0.03 at 16 m.

The model is extended to predict the reproductive potential of discrete populations of the seastar in the Derwent Estuary. The effects of population density, group size, spawning synchrony, sex ratio, and water depth on the total number of eggs fertilized and the proportion of eggs fertilized is predicted. Within the range of parameters tested, group size, density and water depth had the most significant effects on fertilization success. The model predicted a 300% increase in fertilization success when density is increased from 0.025 to 0.2 individuals  $\text{m}^{-2}$ . Spatial variability in the reproductive potential of populations in the estuary is also assessed based on gonad indices of seastars determined at 9 sites in the estuary. Gonad indices of starfish at yacht clubs were 3 times higher than 'control' and wharf sites. Given results of the gamete dispersal model, and spatial variability in density and gonad indices, it is likely that discrete populations in the Derwent Estuary contribute differentially to larval production, and particular populations might potentially be targeted for management.

Dispersal of larvae of the introduced seastar *Asterias amurensis* in the Derwent Estuary, and advection of larvae out of the estuary, is predicted using an

---

inverse transport model incorporating the behavioural responses of larvae at different stages of development to salinity and light. In laboratory conditions larvae demonstrate reverse diel migration, and do not swim into water < 26 ppt salinity. This behaviour influenced the predicted mortality and retention of larvae in the Derwent Estuary. However, regardless of the swimming behaviour, the transport model suggests that the majority (> 99%) of late-stage larvae are advected out of the estuary.

Substrata that induce settlement and metamorphosis of laboratory reared larvae were determined by introducing competent brachiolaria into wells containing substrata commonly available in SE Tasmania. Larvae settled at high rates when exposed to non-geniculate coralline algae ( $0.98 \pm 0.02$  SE after 2 days) and at moderate rates on mud and bare rock ( $0.37 \pm 0.06$  and  $0.44 \pm 0.06$  respectively after 7 days). On day 7, larval settlement on sand and in the control (filtered seawater) were low ( $0.01 \pm 0.01$  and  $0.05 \pm 0.02$  respectively). Based on the distribution of these substrata in the Derwent Estuary, these results suggest that larvae potentially settle at low rates in the lower estuary where the benthos is largely sand, and at moderate rates in the mid-estuary where fine sediments dominate. Settlement at high rates might potentially occur on fringing reefs in the mid and lower estuary, but this habitat comprises a small portion of the estuary.

---

## Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and to the best of my knowledge, contains no material previously published or written by any other person, except where due reference has been given in the text.

This thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the *Copyright Act* 1968.

Alice Morris

18 April 2002

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First I would like to thank my two supervisors: Ron Thresher and Craig Johnson. Ron provided good advice during the project and I thank him for his candour. I am also grateful to Ron for facilitating a stimulating work environment and logistic support at CRIMP. Craig provided valuable advice during the project and I particularly thank him for his assistance during initial stages of the project and during the write-up.

Many people from CSIRO provided ideas, assistance, and support and I thank them for their contribution. Nic Bax, Alan Butler, and Jemery Day provided valuable suggestions on drafts of the various chapters and I thank them for their input. I am grateful to Russ Bradford, Barry Bruce, Mark Green, and Caroline Sutton for providing technical advice during the project and a fun work environment. Val Latham and Trevor McDougall assisted with the design of salinity experiments. I am also thankful to the unidentified fairy that left relevant papers on my desk intermittently throughout the project.

I am grateful to John Keesing for sharing his practical knowledge of how to rear larvae on a large scale. Alan Beech and Bill Wilkinson also provided technical advice and assistance with larval rearing and algal culture. Russ Babcock provided valuable input at the initial stages of the project. The inspiration for a lot of this work came from Russ and Craig, and I am particularly indebted to Russ for teaching me how to cook a nasty pizza. I would also like to thank Jeff Ross and Piers Dunstan for assistance in the field and the rest of Craig's lab for their support.

Chad Hewitt and Britta Schaffelke provided sound advice. Chad also gave me a flexible work environment in the final stages of the thesis, which helped considerably. I thank Alan Jordan who generously gave permission for me to include his habitat mapping data (figure 6.4). I would also like to thank I. P. Freely for offering the loan of a wetsuit, thanks but no thanks, and Dirk Welsford for helping me find Amanda Huggenkiss.

Finally, I thank my friends and family for their support.

This thesis is dedicated to Aunty Chris who'd wake me up in the early hours with a phone call whenever my uni results came out.

---

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### *The threat of marine introductions*

Over the last two decades, marine introductions have been recognised as a major threat to marine environments, marine-based industries, and human health (Carlton 1996, 1999; Carlton and Geller 1993; Hallegraeff 1998; Harvell *et al.* 1999; Lafferty and Kuris 1994, 1996; McLoughlin and Thresher 1994). Many marine invasive species are introduced as larvae through ballast water exchange (Carlton 1996; Carlton and Geller 1993; Ruiz *et al.* 2000) and arrive in the donor port without predators, pathogens or parasites (Lafferty and Kuris 1994). This lack of natural enemies can result in outbreaks of marine invaders which amplifies the impact of these species (Lafferty and Kuris 1994). *Asterias amurensis*, native to the north-west Pacific (Davenport and McLoughlin 1993; Fisher 1930), is an invasive species that has arrived in Australian waters with no parasites (Goggin 1998) and has attained high densities through population outbreak.

### *Asterias amurensis in Australian waters*

*Asterias amurensis* was accidentally introduced into the Derwent Estuary, Tasmania in the early 1980's (Davenport and McLoughlin 1993). Since the introduction, the seastar has become prolific in the estuary, with adult densities reaching up to 9.44 individuals m<sup>-2</sup> (Buttermore *et al.* 1994), and larval densities among the highest of any marine invertebrate (Bruce *et al.* 1995). The density of *A. amurensis* in the middle reaches of the estuary is higher than densities considered as outbreaks in Japan (Buttermore *et al.* 1994; Grannum *et al.* 1996; Morrice 1995; Nojima *et al.* 1986). Given the unprecedented abundance in the Derwent Estuary and the major impact of the seastar on marine-based industries within the native range (Hatanaka and Kosaka 1959; Kim 1969; Nojima *et al.* 1986) *Asterias amurensis* was identified as a target pest species by the Australian Ballast Water Management Advisory Committee (ABWMAC). Over the last decade the seastar was also introduced into Port Phillip Bay, Victoria, and the population size has escalated from 340 000 in 1998 to 75 million in 2000 (Parry and Cohen 2001). The seastar directly impacts marine based industries in Tasmania by settling in scallop spat collectors and oyster trays (Martin and Proctor 2000), and has potential to impact other marine based industries and the marine environment in southern